



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/073,984	02/14/2002	Kouichi Hirasawa	Q68472	6106

7590 05/27/2003

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

GHATT, DAVE A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2854

DATE MAILED: 05/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/073,984

Applicant(s)

HIRASAWA, KOUICHI

Examiner

Dave A Ghatt

Art Unit

2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 17-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3. 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2854

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and **generally limited to a single paragraph** on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. (Emphasis added.) It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 17, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Popat (US 5,997,683). As outlined in the abstract, Popat teaches a method of printing an image on a printing paper using a laser printer. Popat teaches in column 5 lines 1-4, the step of accommodating a printing paper in an accommodating portion 58. Popat also teaches the step of conveying the printing paper from the accommodating portion to a recording device in column 5

lines 10-11. Figure 3 also illustrates the feeding with arrows 70. Column 5 lines 18-21 teach the step of printing an image on the printing paper by the recording device.

With respect to the step of conveying the printing paper from the recording device to a discharging portion, Figure 2 shows a discharging portion on top of the printer, where the printing paper is discharged after printing. Although Popat does not specifically state that the conveying device nips margins of the printer, the applicant should note this is an inherent step in conventional printers as illustrated in Figure 2. In the feeding process, the printer of Popat must nip at least portions of 'margins' of the printer, to the extent that dimensions of margins are defined by the applicant.

Popat also teaches the step of providing printing paper with printing portions and margins, illustrated in Figures 5, 6, 7, and 9. As outlined in column 4 lines 21-26, detaching at least one printing portion from the printing paper after the printing paper with an image is discharged to the discharging portion forms the print.

With respect to claim 19, as stated in the abstract the recording device of Popat is set to print on at least one printing portion of the printing paper. With respect to the step of the margin allowing for errors generated when the recording device prints an image on the printing paper, the applicant should note that insofar as this step is defined, the margin of Popat also allows for errors.

With respect to claim 20, Popat teaches in Figures 5 and 6, margins provided along a direction in which the conveying device conveys the printing paper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Popat (US 5,997,683) in view of Shingu et al. (US 5,824,178). As outlined in the above rejection to claims 17, 19, and 20, Popat teaches all the claimed steps, including the step of providing a printing paper with a printing material, a base material, an adhesive layer, as illustrated in Figure 4. In fact, Popat teaches all the claimed steps except for setting a predetermined value for the sum of a thickness of printing paper, and the setting of a predetermined value for nipping pressure at which margins are nipped by the conveying device. Shingu et al. teaches a web-conveying device that conveys a web in a similar manner as taught by Popat. Shingu et al. teaches in column 12 lines 63-67, the setting of predetermined nipping pressure for a predetermined thickness of sheets. To one of ordinary skill in the art, it would have been obvious to use predetermined values as taught by Shingu et al., in the process of Popat, in order to have different nip pressures based on different thickness, as taught by Shingu et al. in column 12 lines 63-65.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The applicant's attention is invited to the patents of Johnsen (US 4,033,611 teaching the printing on a printing paper, feeding the printing paper via margins, and forming the final


prints by detaching printing portions), and Bishop et al. (US 5,571,587 teaching the printing on a printing paper, feeding the printing paper, and forming the final prints by detaching printing portions).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave A Ghatt whose telephone number is (703) 308-2417. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Friday 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew H Hirshfeld can be reached on (703) 305-6619. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-3431.

DAG
May 5, 2003


ANDREW H. HIRSHFELD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800